

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

JOHN GALLOWAY, individually, and on behalf of all other similarly situated, <i>et al.</i>	)	
	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	<b>Civil Action No. 1:07-cv-06435</b>
vs.	)	
	)	
APARTMENT INVESTMENT AND MANAGEMENT COMPANY, <i>et al.</i>	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

**JOINT STATUS REPORT**

---

**I. BACKGROUND**

Defendant Apartment Investment and Management Company (“AIMCO”) is a real estate investment trust (“REIT”) which, by and through affiliates, owns apartment communities nationwide. The remaining Defendants are subsidiaries of the REIT which currently employ, or have employed, the Plaintiffs as maintenance personnel at apartment communities located in New York.

As part of their job duties, maintenance personnel respond to calls from apartment tenants for emergency and non-emergency repairs. Maintenance personnel are sometimes also required to be available to work after regularly scheduled hours on an on-call basis. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants did not pay Plaintiffs either for all the time worked while on-call or for time spent waiting to receive emergency service requests during their on-call time. Defendants contend they pay their maintenance personnel for time spent responding to tenant calls but contend they are not legally obligated to pay maintenance personnel for the time they spend engaged in non-work activities during their on-call time.

Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint asserts two separate claims for relief under wage and hour laws. First, Plaintiffs allege that they were not paid for hours worked in excess of 40 in a workweek spent responding to emergency tenant service requests while they were on-call (the "unpaid overtime claim"). Second, some, but not all, Plaintiffs allege that their ability to engage in personal pursuits while "on-call" was so limited that the time they spent "on call" waiting to receive emergency service requests from tenants should be compensable ("the waiting time claim"). Defendants deny the allegations of both claims.

## **II. STATUS**

Pursuant to the case management plan adopted by the Court, the parties have completed their responses to written discovery and exchanged initial disclosures with respect to each of the eleven plaintiffs. The parties then were able to use that information to commence mediation.

The parties met with mediator Hunter Hughes on April 28, 2008 in an attempt to resolve not only this case, but also the 20 other similar cases pending in various courts nationwide. The parties have not yet reached any agreement, but discussions are continuing.

## **III. PLAN TO COMPLETE DISCOVERY**

- (1) The parties propose to complete all remaining discovery by December 31, 2008.
- (2) The parties propose that any expert reports be produced by November 1, 2008 and any rebuttal reports produced by December 1, 2008.
- (3) The parties propose that a deadline for dispositive motions be set for 30 days after the close of discovery.

Dated: May 1, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/Gregory Reilly

Gregory Reilly  
LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.  
885 Third Avenue, 16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, N.Y. 10022-4834  
Telephone: (212) 583-2861  
Facsimile: (212) 832-2719

and

John M. Husband, P.C.  
Thomas E.J. Hazard, P.C.  
Christina F. Gomez  
Tanya E. Milligan  
HOLLAND & HART, LLP  
555 Seventeenth Street  
Suite 3200  
Denver, CO 80202  
Telephone: (303) 295-8000  
Facsimile: (303) 295-8261

By: /s/Llezlie L. Green

Joseph M. Sellers  
Charles E. Tompkins  
Llezlie L. Green (lg-0911)  
COHEN, MILSTEIN, HAUSFELD &  
TOLL P.L.L.C.  
1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 500, West Tower  
Washington, DC 20005  
Telephone: (202) 408-4600  
Facsimile: (202) 408-4699

and

Steig Olson (so-0414)  
COHEN, MILSTEIN, HAUSFELD &  
TOLL, P.L.L.C.  
152 East 52<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Thirtieth Floor  
New York, N.Y. 10022  
Telephone: (212) 838-7797  
Facsimile: (212) 838-7745

*Attorney for Defendants*

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*